TC 2800 MAIL ROOM

THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

(Case No. P043D2C3C)

Application of:

FARMWALD et al.

No: 09/492,982

Filed: JANUARY 27, 2000

Title: METHOD OF OPERATING A MEMORY

DEVICE HAVING A VARIABLE DATA

INPUT LENGTH

Assistant Commissioner for Patents

Washington, DC 20231

Group

Before

)

Examiner: Nguyen

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal I Service as first class mail with sufficient postage in an envelope addressed to the Commissioner of

Mailing Correspondence)

. 26.200/

INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

Dear Sir:

In compliance with the duty of disclosure set forth in 37 C.F.R. \$1.56, Applicants' submit concurrently herewith an Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) including modified Form PTO-1449.

Some of the documents listed in the PTO-1449 have been cited by a defendant in an action pending in U.S. District Court For Eastern District of Virginia case, namely in Rambus Inc. v. Infineon Technologies A.G., et al., as prior art against the inventions claimed in, among other patents, U.S. 6,034,918. The '918 patent is a parent of the instant application. Reference to these documents are listed on page 2 of the Defendents' AMENDED PRIOR ART NOTICE PURSUANT TO 35 U.S.C. §282 (hereinafter "PRIOR ART NOTICE"). A copy of the PRIOR ART NOTICE is enclosed herewith.

Furthermore, the construction or interpretation of a number of terms have recently been considered in a Markman opinion issued in the above-mentioned litigation. A number of claims pending in the instant application incorporate or incorporated some of these terms including, for example, the terms "block size", "write request", and "bus". The term "write request" has been deleted from the pending claims (as

amended). The term "bus" has been deleted from some of the pending claims (as amended). A discussion of "block size" may be found on pages 41-47 of the *Markman* opinion, and a discussion of "bus" may be found on pages 17-41 of the *Markman* opinion.

By submission of this *Markman* opinion, Applicants make no statement as to the correctness of the constructions set forth therein. Indeed, as is apparent from that opinion, the court substantially adopted the constructions proposed by the defendants, and not that construction proposed by Rambus, the owner of the instant application. A copy of the *Markman* opinion is also enclosed herewith.

Date: 1/21/26, 2001

Respectfully submitted,

Neil A. Steinberg Reg. No. 34,735

650-947-5325